Report of the Committee on Petitions on the petition signed by Shri Muthusamy, General Secretary, Tamil Nadu Teachers' Federation and two others regarding pay and service conditions of the teachers in the country and matters conencted therewith.

MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE BOARD FOR SEAFARERS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Sir, I beg to move:

That in pursuance of clause (i) of rule 4 of the National Welfare Board for Seafarers Rules, 1963, as amended, made under sub-section (2) of section 218 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among the members of the House to be a member of the National Welfare Board for Seafarers.

The question was put and the motion was adopted

MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE NATIONAL SHIPPING BOARD

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Sir I beg to move:

That in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 4 of the National Shipping Board Rules 1960, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct two members from among the members of the House to be members of the National Shipping Board in the vacancies caused by the retirement of Shri R. Mohahnarangam and Dr. Joseph Leon D'Souza from the membership of the Rajya Sabha with effect from the 29th June, 1986 and 4th July, 1986, respectively

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up the Calling Attention Motion.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Problems being experienced by the Handloom Sector since the declaration of the new Textile Policy

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jagdambi Prasad Yadav.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : श्रीमन्, मैं नई वस्त्र नीति की घोषणा के बाद से हथकरघा क्षेत्र को पेश आ रही समस्याओं तथा इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही की ओर वस्त्र मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूं ।

Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN). Sir,..

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): May I make a submission? There are Special Mentions coming to you. They have to come first before this matter is taken up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have not decided like this. I understand that the Business Advisory Committee is going to take a decision on this.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): During the last three years it is changed.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Sir, no Special problems in the handloom sector have been reported since the declaration of the new

[Shri Khurshid Alam Khan]

Textile Policy. As a matter of fact, keeping in view the unique status of the handloom sector, the Textile Policy enumerated various measures to be taken for the growth and development of this sector. Since the announcement of the new Textile Policy, the Government have taken the following steps to implement these measures:—

(i) Two major welfare schemes have been taken up. Under the Workshed-cum-Housing Scheme during 1985-86, assistance to the tune of Rs. 96.20 lakhs was provided to 12 States for taking up construction of 5,920 units comprising work-sheds as well as workshed-cum-houses. Under the other welfare scheme, called the Thrift Fund Scheme, an assistance of Rs. 40.19 lakhs was released to 8 States to cover about 1.37 lakhs weavers.

(ii) Pursuant to the stipulation in the Textile Policy to transfer the Production of cheap cloth to handloom sector, the target for production of janata cloth in the handloom sector has been increased from 360 million square metres at the end of 1984-85 to 500 million square metres during 1986-87.

(iii) Under the Handlooms (Reservation of Articles for Production) Act, 1985, on the advice of the Advisory Committee as provided in the Act, a Notification reserving 22 items of cotton, silk, wool and blends for exclusive production in the handloom sector has been issued. Three Regional Offices at Delhi, Pune and Coimbatore have been set up for the implementation of the Reservation Orders.

(iv) To encourage production of mixed and blended fabrics by handlooms with a view to improve the earnings of the weavers, the Government have decided to supply duty free fibre for production of blended cloth by the State handloom agencies. Further, the Office of the Development Commissioner for Handlooms, in collaboration with the Petrofils Limited, Baroda, have organised 21 training programmes for weavers in 11 States and 1 Union Territory to train them on weaving of polyester and polyester blended cloth during 1985-86. 24 such training programmes are proposed to be undertaken during 1986-87. The Weavers' Service Centres have also been strengthened by setting up special looms for undertaking demonstration and training of polyester weaving.

(v) Central Government has been implementing a scheme for modernisation and renovation of handlooms with matching assistance from the State and the Central Government. During the year 1986-87, it has been decided to give a special thrust to the modernisation of handlooms, and for this purpose, a target of modernisation of 30,000 looms has been fixed. A budget provision of Rs. 175 lakhs has been made in the Central budget for the current year.

In addition to the measures enumerated above, certain other concessions and facilities available to the handloom sector are as follows:—

(i) Complete exemption from excise duty on plain reel hank yarn;

(ii) 50% concession on double cross reel hank yarn when purchased by registered handloom co-operative societies and State handloom development corporations.

(iii) Complete exemption of processing duty for cotton, wool and polyester fabrics made on handlooms when processed by factories set up by State handloom development corporations and Apex handloom cooperative societies.

(iv) Concessional processing duty on processing of cotton and woollen fabrics made on handlooms processed by independent processors, approved by Government.

(v) Complete exemption from excise duty of certain types of polyester blended yarn when purchased by State handloom development corporations and handloom cooperative societies.

(vi) There is a network of 23 Weavers' Service Centres to undertake training, service and research for the handloom sector. There are also three Institutes of Handloom Technology which are conducting 3-year diploma courses in handloom technology.

(vii) The Central Government provides 100% loan assistance to State Governments for setting up of pre-loom and post-loom processing facilities for the handloom sector.

(viii) Projects for modernisation and marketing assistance to handlooms in minority concentration areas have been sanctioned in 6 States with 100% grant from the Central Government to the tune of Rs. 109.92 lakhs.

(ix) A project for development of handlooms in hill areas of U.P. has been sanctioned at a cost of Rs. 7.99 crores with matching assistance from the State and Central Governments.

(x) Some more schemes for marketing support and training of weavers are under consideration including Marketing Complex in which a beginning has been made.

One of the main problems facing the handloom sector is the supply of yarn of required counts and at reasonable prices. The handloom sector has to depend mainly on the organised mill sector for supply of yarn and since most of the yarn trade is in private hands, speculative trends are usually noticed in yarn prices. Government have taken a number of measures from time to time to tackle the situation of rising yarn prices and non-availability of yarn. As mentioned in the Textile Policy, the operations of the National Handloom Development Corporation, which has been set up with the main object of supplying yarn to the handloom sector, has been stepped up and in its second year of operation, the Corporation has effected a sales turnover of nearly Rs. 7 crores.

The position of hank yarn, both in regard to availability and prices, has been quite easy for more than a year. As compared to the prices a year ago, the current prices for various counts have come down by about 4.6% to 30.2%, the reduction being marked in the case of lower counts particularly upto 30s. There have also been no complaints either from the State Governments or from the State handloom agencies regarding prices or availability of yarn. In fact, the main complaint today is that of accumulation of yarn with the mills.

From the facts mentioned above, it can be seen that the handloom sector has not faced any serious problem since the declaration of the new Textile Policy. As a matter of fact, both in terms of production as well as exports, it has performed better in 1985-86 as compared to 1984-85. During 1985-86, the production of handloom sector is estimated to be 3,680 million metres and the exports were of the order of Rs. 361.59 crores, as compared to 3,514 million metres and Rs. 348.86 crores, respectively, during 1984-85.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार): माननीय उपसभापति जी, संसार के सब से पुराने कुटीर उद्योग के रूप में हथकरघा उद्योग वस्त्र उद्योग भारत का प्राचीन उद्योग है। मानव की सभ्यता की कहानी परिधान से है, वस्त्र से है और वस्त्र की कल्पना के बिना बुनकर की कल्पना नहीं की जा सकती है। इसलिए इसका भारत की सभ्यता के साथ सीधा सम्बन्ध है और हथकरघा उद्योग का सम्बन्ध भारत के आर्थिक विकास से भी सीधा है। यह उद्योग चार करोड़ लोगों को जीवन देता है, करघे का आंकड़ा लगभग तीन करोड़ से ऊपर है।। परोक्ष और अपरोक्ष रूप से यह लगभग एक करोड़ 52 लाख लोगों को काम देता है और इस में 30% दुर्बल घटक हैं जिनके पास जमीन नहीं है। उन्हीं के बीच में यह उद्योग आदिकाल से चला है। 1985 की कपड़ा नीति में हथकरघा उद्योग का एक हाथ तोड दिया गया था। आजादी की लड़ाई में हथकरघा उद्योग आजादी की लड़ाई के साथ और आजादी के बाद देश में रोजगार जुटाने के काम में ताना-बाना का काम करता रहा है और मुझे यह कहते हुए दुख होता है कि कागज पर जितनी भी बात बताई गई है वास्तव में वह बात जमीन पर नहीं है। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि जो यह नीति है पांच वर्ष के भीतर भीतर हो सकता है कि इस हथकरघा को समाप्ति की ओर न ले जाए। मैं मन्त्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि पावर लूम्ज और मिलों की असमानता की होड़ में खुदबखुद हैंडलूम किस प्रकार उसका मुकाबला कर सकता है। वह संगठित है, साधन-सम्पन्न है, प्रचार उसके साथ है और सिर्फ साधन ही नहीं है बल्कि आप भी उसके साथ हैं, आपकी सब उदार सहायता उनके साथ है बल्कि 750 करोड़ रुपया ले कर उनकी मदद के लिए है। आपकी मान्यता भी है बिना आपकी उदार मदद के वह एक इंच भी आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है। उस उदारता के रूप में आपने हैंडलूम के लिए कौन सी नीति अपनाई है। मैं समझता हूं कि हैंडलूम वाले जिनका पेट आधा भरा हुआ है अन्न के कारण, तन भी आधा ढका हुआ है उनकी रोजी भी आप आधी कर रहे हैं। इस तरह से ऐसा लगता है कि रोजगार छीनने की व्यवस्था इस में है। आपने एक बहुत बड़ा डाकुमेंट पढ़ा है लेकिन उस में रोजगार कितना बढ़ा है इसका कहीं भी कोई उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। वैसे हमारे स्वर्गीय मन्त्री श्री चन्द्रशेखर सिंह जी ने कहा था कि इस नीति से 10 मिलियन लोगों को काम मिलेगा। उसका कहीं पर कोई उल्लेख नहीं है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि सन् 1950 से यह नीति रही है कि मिलों का उत्पादन एक निश्चित सीमा पर बाँध कर रखा जाए ताकि हथकरघा बुनकरों का रोजगार सुरक्षित रहे और उस समय राजा जी ने इस बात की सम्भावना को ठीक किया और गांधी जी का सहयोग इस में था ही लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि इन्दिरा जी ने भी तीन जनवरी, 1983 को जो 11 सूत्री कपड़ा नीति तय की गई थी उस में उन्होंने गरीब और निर्बल लोगों और महिलाओं के लिए निश्चित काम और प्रगति की निशानी कहा था और उसको कृतसंकल्प बताया था लेकिन यहां पर मैं देखता हूं कि वैसा कुछ भी नहीं लगता है। मैं जब आपकी नीति का हिसाब किताब देखता हूं। जहां तक हैंडलूम चलता है, जहां पर हथकरघे का काम होता है वहां पर लगता है कि पावरलूम के बड़े बड़े उद्यमियों और मिलों के आगे ये टूटते जा रहे हैं। इसलिए शिवरामन कमेटी ने पावरलूम और मिलों पर निश्चित प्रतिबंध लगाने की बात कही थी। इसलिए कहा था कि एक पावरलूम 24 हाथों से काम छीन लेता है इसीलिए आपने जो लच्छेदार बातें कहीं हैं, लगता है कि यह है तो दूध लेकिन पीने में जहर के समान यह काम करता है। शिवरामन कमेटी ने कहा था कि पावरलूम को 5 प्रतिशत से अधिक विकास करने का मौका न दिया जाये। लेकिन रोक न होने के कारण डेढ़ सौ प्रतिशत उनकी बाढ़ आई है। हथकरघे में आपने क्या नीति रखी है यह मैं नहीं समझ पाता हूं। पहले हथकरघे की नीति, कपड़े की नीति तय की जाती थी कि कम पूंजी में अधिक कपड़ा बने और अधिक

लोगों को काम मिले। लेकिन इस हिसाब से आपने इसको पाइलट नहीं किया है। 11 सूत्री कपड़े की नीति और महालनवीस समिति की नीति का प्रतिपादन होता रहा था लेकिन आपकी इस नीति से दोनों का हिसाब किताब समाप्त हो रहा है। जो सुरक्षित आपने किया है उसमें दो बातें मैं कहना चाहता हूं। सुरक्षित किस ढंग से किया है? जब आपने पावरलूम और कपड़ा मिलों को पूरी आजादी दे दी है पूरी छूट दे दी है तो सुरक्षा के लिए कौन सा कोना है। यह शब्दों के आडम्बर की सुरक्षा है या वास्तव में कोई कोना बचता है। मुझे तो लगता है कि मिलों और पावरलूम को इस प्रकार की छूट दी है ताकि कपड़े के बाजार को जल्दी से जल्दी कब्जे में कर लें और कहीं, कोई भी क्षेत्र ऐसा न बचे जहां पर कि हथकरघा अपना स्थान बना सके। आपने थोड़ा सा स्टेटमेंट में दिया है कि कुछ प्रोडेक्शन बढ़ा है लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि हर जगह यह स्टैगनेंट है, स्टैगनेंट चिन्ह है कि यह धीरे धीरे डाइ आउट की ओर बढ़ रहा है। इसलिए मैं आपसे कुछ प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं आपके उत्तर के संदर्भ में। हथकरघा उद्योग अपनी क्षमता से खुलकर विकसित होने के लिए जो 8 लंगड़े कदम उठाये गये थे उसका परिणाम अभी तक देखने में क्या आया है? क्या इससे यह उद्योग पावरलूम और मिलों की ओर से होने वाले ताकतवर हमले को बर्दाश्त कर सकता है? कंट्रोल कपड़ा बनाकर जो जो मिलें बीमार बनीं थी लाइलाज हुई थीं उनकी महान जिम्मेदारी आपने हथकरघा उद्योग पर लाद दी है यह कहकर कि यह उनके लिए महान उपकार होगा। यह लच्छेदार भाषा हो सकती है लेकिन इससे हथकरघा और खादी दोनों पर एक आफत लादी गयी है, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि एक तो यूं ही कपड़ा हैंडलूम में जो मजदूर लगे रहते हैं उनको 5 या 6 रुपये रोजी पड़ती है इस कपड़े के बनाने पर जो कम कीमत का होगा जिससे कम पैसे मिलेंगे तो इन कम पैसों के मिलने पर फिर क्षतिपूर्ति के लिए आपने कौन सी योजना बनायी है? आपने 50,000 टपरे जो बनाने वाले थे, उसके बारे में बात की है लेकिन उनका आवंटन जो है वह पर्याप्त नहीं है। इसमें 10-15 या 20 प्रतिशत टपरे बन जायें तो शायद मैं समझता हूं कि वि ये भी ज्यादा होंगे। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि 5 वर्ष में जो 10 लाख स्त्री पुरुषों को काम मिलने वाला था वह अब तक कितना मिला है, शुरूआत हुई है? जिससे यह पता लगे कि इससे सचमुच कुछ होगा।

मैं इसके साथ एक बात और मिलाना चाहता हूं कि इस पावरलूम की बढ़ती ताकत से और मिलों की ताकत से मशीन के तकनीक के कारण जो मजदूर संगठित क्षेत्र में उजड़ेंगे उनके पुर्नवास की बात की गयी है लेकिन जो दूरस्थ गांवों में हैं जहां पर कोई काम नहीं है, विकल्प नहीं है, बिजली नहीं है आवागमन के साधन नहीं है अगर वे हथकरघा वाले उजड़ेंगे तो उनके पुर्नवास के लिए क्या आपने इसमें कोई योजना रखी है अगर नहीं रखी है तो ऐसा क्यों है?

मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि बुनकरों का संबंध खेती से था जब खेती होती थी तो बुनकर खेत में काम करते थे जब खेती में काम नहीं होता था तो बुनकरी करते थे। लेकिन आपको पता होगा कि खेती में भी हारवेस्टर आ रहा है। तो हारवेस्टर आने से खेती के काम से भी मजदूरों को छुट्टी मिलेगी।

तो एक हाथ तो आपने नई नीति से काटा और दूसरा हाथ उसका हारवेस्टर काट लेगा। तो हारवेस्टर के कारण से और भी स्थिति खतरनाक होगी और दोनों पांव से चल कर बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश के जो गरीब मजदूर आते थे, उनके हाथ-पांव दोनों कट जायेंगे जब हारवेस्टर पंजाब और हरियाणा में काम करना शुरु करेगा। तो उस समय आप.....

(व्यवधान)

श्री खुर्शीद आलम खान : हारवेस्टर को बात तो... (व्यवधान) से पूछिये।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : लेकिन उसका असर आपके विभाग के हथकरघा मजदूरों पर बहुत पड़ रहा है। एक हाथ जो बचा था वह हारवेस्टर काट देगा दोनों हाथ काटे। आप हिसाब क्या करेंगे?

तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि उनके हाथ बचें, इसके लिए आपने अपनी नीति में कौनसा हिसाब किया है, यानी रोजगार जुटाने का? आपका वास्तविक काम तो यह है कि रोजगार कैसे जुटाया जाए। क्या सरकार गारंटी देगी कि जो बुनकर नई नीति के कारण विस्थापित होंगे, वह उनको मुआवजा देगी और उनके पुनर्वास की व्यवस्था करेगी?

मैं समझता हूं कि यह जो आप नई नीति लाये हैं, इससे जो लोगों को बड़ा उत्साह और आशा भाव मिला है, ऐसे लोग उन मिलों और पावरलूम से जुड़े हुए हैं। उनमें से बहुत से ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने गांव देखा नहीं है। उन्होंने बेरोजगारी या अर्ध-बेरोजगारी का सामना नहीं किया है। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री खुर्शीद आलम खान : पावरलूम वाले जो लोग हैं, वह कहते हैं कि सारा हथकरघा को दे दिया है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : मैं आपसे जरा साफ शब्दों में यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस भाव को आप स्वयं समझ कर इस सदन में हम लोगों को भी समझाना चाहेंगे क्या?

खेती के बाद अधिक रोजगार देने वाला उद्योग हथकरघा उद्योग ही है। आधुनिक वस्त्र में जो आदमी लगे हैं, वे वैसे कपड़ा 35-40 प्रतिशत तैयार करते हैं, लेकिन उनकी संख्या सिर्फ छह लाख हैं। इसका आंकड़ा तो ठीक-ठीक नहीं कहा जा सकता, कुछ मोटे-मोटे आंकड़े मैंने बताये हैं, लेकिन जो कपड़ा पैदा करते हैं, उसमें 25 प्रतिशत यह कपड़ा तैयार करते है हथकरघा क्षेत्र में, लेकिन आदमी इसमें लगभग एक करोड़ बावन लाख काम करते हैं। तो यह जो पर्सपैक्टिव है, इसका इस नीति के अंदर हिसाब किया है क्या? खादी में भी 15 लाख काम करते हैं और वह भी 25 प्रतिशत कपड़ा पैदा करते हैं। तो इस पर्सपैक्टिव में सिंघारमण कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को ध्यान में रखते हुए आपने इसके लिए कुछ व्यवस्था करने की कोशिश की है कि नहीं? जिस प्रकार संगठित क्षेत्र के लिए आपने 750 करोड़ की व्यवस्था की है, इसके लिए क्या किया है?

कपड़े की व्यवस्था के लिए यार्न दिलाने की बात यहां की गई हैं, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि विस्कोस स्टेपल फाईबर की आज बहुत कमी चल रही है। दाम भी इसके बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। स्वदेशी मिल जो पैदा करते हैं, वह सारी आवश्यकताओं का 40 प्रतिशत है और जहां विदेशी यार्न का दाम 35 रुपये किलो पड़ता है, वहां स्वदेशी का दाम 25 रुपये प्रति किलो पड़ता है और 100 प्रतिशत हथकरघा उद्योग उसी धागे पर निर्भर करता है। तो इस उद्योग को सस्ती दर पर और सुलभतापूर्वक धागा उपलब्ध कराने की व्यवस्था आपने कौनसी की है? यह जरा मैं जानना चाहता हूं।

इसलिए मैं आपसे आग्रह करना चाहता हूं कि 1980-81 के सर्वेक्षण के अनुसार हथकरघा में 16.80 लाख लोग काम करते थे, योजना आयोग ने 84 लाख बताया है, वस्त्र मंत्रालय ने एक करोड़ बताया है, अब इस नीति से कितने लोगों की संख्या बढ़ी या घटी है, इसके क्या कारण हैं?

श्री अरविंद गणेश कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र): वह सब इमेजिनेशन है... (व्यवधान) जो तीन-चार फिगर्ज आपने पढ़ी हैं। उनके पास असल फिगर ही नहीं है: वह उसी को दोहराते हैं।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : यह फिगर तो मैंने बताई है । पर इनको यह फिगर्ज कौन देता है ? यह फिगर पर फिगर बढ़ाते आते हैं । वास्तविक में जो लोग हथकरघा में लगे हुए हैं, यह बेरोजगार, बिना काम के होते जा रहे हैं । ऐसी अवस्था में यह हथकरघा के लिए क्या करना चाहते हैं इस कागज पर और यथार्थ में ?

मैं समझता हूं मंत्री जी कि बड़ी संख्या वाले देश में इस योजना को परखने के लिए तीन कसौटियां होनी चाहिए । इससे रोजगार में कितने अवसर प्राप्त होंगे उत्पादन कितना बढ़ेगा ? (**समय की घंटी**) वितरण की व्यवस्था कैसे काम करेगी ? क्या इस पर नई कपड़ा नीति खरी उतरी है ? जरा इसको टैस्ट करके बताया जाता तो मैं निश्चित रूप से आपका शुक्रगुजार होता । मैं जानना चाहता हूं चक्रवर्ती राजगोपालाचारी ने जिन बातों की ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाया कि कम पूंजी से अधिक लोगों को काम मिल सके, उसके लिए आपने क्या किया ? हथकरघा और संगठित मिल है, असमानता की लड़ाई कम ही इसको दूर करने के लिए आपने इस नई नीति में जो कि आपके द्वारा न सही लेकिन आपके निर्देशों द्वारा बनाई गई है : जिसमें आप सुधार कर सकते हैं उसके लिए आपने क्या किया है ? दूसरी बात इसके साथ जब आरक्षण में इसके रखने की बात होती है तो एक रैपरकशन इसका रेशम उद्योग पर आता है, जो रेशम उद्योग पावर लूम से चलता है, खास करके 1 से 4 पावरलूम उद्योग हैं जो हैंडलूम से बदल करके रेशम उद्योग में हैं पावरलूम बनाकर रेशम उद्योग के कुछ उत्पादन जो वही कर सकते हैं तो क्या ऐसे उद्योगों की रक्षा के लिए भी आपने कुछ किया है ? रिजर्वेशन की बात हुई हैंडलूम की बात हुई है, लेकिन जो रेशम उद्योग एवं दूसरी एक से चार पावरलूम हैं उसकी रक्षा के लिए जो इसका असर पड़ता जा रहा है इसके लिए क्या किया है ? मैंने देखा है कि कर्नाटक में इस उत्पाद में लग हुए लोगों को एक खुला निमन्त्रण दिया है कि जहां रिजर्वेशन का असर हैंडलम पर पड़ रहा है, उसको लाभ भी नहीं है, फिर भी उसको लाभ सही सलामत दिलाया जाए तो वह असर जाकर बड़ी मिलों पर बड़े पावर लूम के चलने पर नहीं पड़ेगा बल्कि जो छोटे छोटे उद्योग हैं उनके ऊपर असर पड़ सकता है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इसको आप कैसे चैक करना चाहते हैं । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं चाहूंगा कि आप इसका जवाब इस ढंग से दें ताकि देश के हैंडलूम में लगे हुए जो लोग हैं उनका रोजगार नहीं उजड़े, वे विस्थापित नहीं हों और हों भी तो सरकार उनको पुनः स्थापित करेगी साथ ही साथ रेशम उद्योग में, कुटीर उद्योग में लगे लोगों को भी रक्षा की बात साथ-साथ हो । उनकी रक्षा की बात भी साथ-साथ होनी चाहिए, यह मैं चाहता हूं । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the hon. Minister in his statement stated that handloom sector has not faced any serious problem since declaration of new textile policy. This is quite contradictory to the factual position. On behalf of AIADMK I am to state that we disagree with this statement. Handloom industry is an important and vital industry in our economy. It gives more employment to the weaker sections than any other sector, except agriculture. There are 38.07 lakh handlooms all over the country. More than ten million people depend on this industry for their livelihood. At present, their share of annual production of handloom is 30 per cent, powerloom 40 per cent and composite mill-30 per cent. Various measures so far taken by the Centre and State Governments have failed to create an impact on the life and socio-economic position of the weavers. That is why, bulk of weaving community still live below poverty line.

Recent reduction in rebate days from 45 to 30 for handloom fabrics is a severe blow to the industry which has resulted, as far Tamil Nadu is concerned, in accumulation of stocks worth Rs. 85 crores throwing a lot of people out of employment. Sub-Formerly, 20 per cent rebate was

[Shri Alladi Amna *alias* Arunachalam]

given for 60 days in a year. Subsidy amount was equally shared by the Centre and the State on 50:50 basis. Government of India reduced the rebate days unexpectedly from 60 to 45 in the year 1985-86 and for 1986-87 it has further reduced to 30 days. Regarding the rebate in the wholesale sector, it has issued unfair orders reducing its share to 25 per cent and a heavy share of 75 per cent to State Government. This is also another blow to the industry. Government is acting against its policies and decisions placed before the House. I would like to refer here to the Demands for Grants for the year 1986-87, wherein, it has been clearly mentioned. 'Besides direct subsidy for the production of Janata cloth, a rebate at the rate of 20 per cent is also provided on sale of handloom cloth other than Janata cloth through the State Governments for a period of sixty days in a year'. It has also been stated that the rebate is to be shared equally between the Centre and the State Government. This is the latest policy-statement of the Government which has been approved by Parliament. But orders are issued which are contrary to this policy-statement. I am not able to understand the reason for issuing such orders. Therefore, I strongly condemn the decision of the Government for reducing the rebate days from 45 to 30, without any principle and justification.

Sir, from the inception of the First-Five-Year Plan up to the Fourth Five-Year Plan, the amount spent in the case of the handloom sector has been only Rs. 100 crores. In the Fifth Five-Year Plan, it was only Rs. 99 crores and in the Sixth Five-Year Plan, Rs. 120 crores. The proposed provision in the Seventh Five-Year Plan is Rs. 168 crores. When you compare this allocation and assistance provided for in the various Five-Year Plans with that provided for the textile mills, you will find that assistance given to the handloom sector is very meagre. Crores of rupees are being spent in the case of powerlooms and the textile industry. Sir, for the year 1983-84, the National Textile Corporation, which was set up to take over and run the sick textile mills, incurred a loss of 189.5 crores. After March, 1984, from April up to December, 1984 alone, the loss has been Rs. 131.78 crores. Every year, for the sake of the sick textile mills, the National Textile Corporation is incurring heavy loss. In addition to this, up to the end of March, 1984, a sum of Rs. 580.25, crores has been sanctioned as soft loan to the textile industry. I am not at all against such measures. I am not at all against the powerlooms. I am not at all against the textile industry. But my point is, while the Government has helped these sectors to this extent, they have totally neglected the handloom sector. There is no need for any explanation. It is an admitted fact that handloom sector cannot compete with the powerlooms and the textile industry. That is why, the policy of reservation was introduced. The system of reservation and rebate are essential for the development of the handloom sector. Rebate is prevalent not only in the case of handlooms. It is also prevalent in the private sector. Nowadays, without rebate, it is very difficult to increase sales. Therefore, rebate system is a permanent feature of the handloom industry. From the very beginning, the policy of reservation has been resisted by powerlooms and the textile mills. They did not allow the handloom sector to enjoy the fruits of this policy. In the beginning, reservation was introduced under the Essential Commodities Act. It was questioned in the court of law. A stay was granted and the case is pending. Then, the Government passed the Handlooms (Reservation of Articles for Production) Act, 1985. This also has been questioned in the court of law. A stay has been granted against this Act. Sir, the handloom sector is not able to enjoy even what was supposed to have been assigned to this sector. So, in order to protect the interest of the 10 million

weavers the remedy is that the Act should be included in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution. Already the Ninth Schedule consists of 188 Acts. This Act may be the 189th Act of the Ninth Schedule. The Government of India is spending enormous amount under subsidy system. In the year 1975-76 the subsidy amount was Rs. 470 crores and now it has escalated to Rs. 4921 crores. This subsidy amount is largely utilised for fertilizers, food, controlled cloth and export promotion. Out of this amount of Rs. 4921 crores the subsidy given to the handloom sector, including controlled cloth, is only Rs. 53 crores. The average comes to .002 per cent. We must be ashamed of this allocation. We must be ashamed of this amount which is given as subsidy for 10 million handloom weavers. To protect the interest of the 10 million handloom weavers it is in no way going to be helpful. The unfortunate factor is, now the Government is thinking of further reducing the rebate days, ignoring the poor condition of the weavers. India is a country of religious festivals. To cover all the religious festivals and other occasions thirty days are not sufficient. There is another discrimination. You have allowed the Khadi Board to have 90 rebate days. If that is so, I do not know why you are reducing the number of rebate days in case of handloom weavers. Why is there this discrimination? Therefore, I appeal to the hon. Minister to restore the 60 rebate days on 50:50 basis.

Then, Sir, considering the tough competition from the powerloom and textile industry, Government should give patronage to the handloom sector. Our hon. Chief Minister, Dr. Puratchi Thalaivar MGR has written a letter to the Home Minister asking him to permit the employees of the Central Government to utilise the credit facility for handloom fabrics. You have expressed some practical difficulties to accept this credit facility to the employees of the Central Government. But, Sir, this credit facility scheme is successfully functioning in Tamil Nadu and there seems to be no reason why it is impracticable as far as employees of the Central Government are concerned. Therefore, I request you to reconsider your stand and allow the Central Government employees to avail themselves of the credit facility for handloom fabrics.

Sir, before I conclude, I would request the hon. Minister to take the following steps. Firstly, in order to protect the interest of 10 million handloom weavers will the Government come forward to include the handlooms (Reservation of Articles for Production) Act, in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution? Secondly, will the Government restore 60 rebate days as is prevalent at present? And lastly, will the Government issue orders allowing the employees of the Central Government to avail themselves of the crdit facility available to them at least in Tamil Nadu. With these words, I conclude.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Minister, while giving a statement, has started by saying, "No special problems in the handloom sector have been reported since the declaration of the new Textile Policy." Sir, we had an occasion to say on the floor of this House the problems that are being faced by the handloom sector. At that time we had also stated the problems that were likely to come up. Therefore, either the Minister does not have sufficient information as to what problems are being faced by the handloom sector and the handloom weavers or he is trying to paint a rosy picture so that he can satisfy other sectors which have been benefited by the new textile policy. Sir, one of the objectives of the new textile policy was to increase the production of cloth in the handloom sector and the mills and restrict the growth of powerloom sector. Anybody who has some access to the figures about the growth of the powerloom sector will say that this objective has totally

[Prof. C. Lakshmana]

failed. Sir, the new textile policy stated that effective measures would be taken to see that the powerlooms do not encroach upon articles reserved for exclusive production by the handlooms. Sir, the new textile policy itself was to some extent discriminatory against the handlooms. In the garb of providing curbs for handloom sector, they reserved certain items and they de-reserved certain other items; they moved away from the policy of protectionism. If that is the case, is the Minister not aware that there have been several cases now filed by the handloom sector questioning reservation of the type of cloth which was reserved for the handloom sector? The new textile policy has stated that the organisational set-up required for the above purpose shall be strengthened. I would like to ask the Minister what that organisational setup is which has been stepped up in order to protect the interests of handloom sector. If the Minister had stated as to what are those steps taken by him during the last one year since the new textile policy has been enunciated in order to protect the interests of weavers in the handloom sector, then perhaps there would have been justification in laying a special claim that no special problems have come to his notice. But as I had occasion to state while participating in the debate on the new textile policy, the 1985 policy statement was a departure from the 1981 policy statement as far as the handloom sector is concerned. That position still continues to be where it was.

Then, Sir, the hank yarn norm has been flouted by spinning mills, especially in the South. They have sought stay orders from the court which have been granted. As a result the whole policy which was to be pivotal in the new textile policy has been put to difficulties. If that is the case, how can the Minister say that position has eased as far as this is concerned.

Then, the entire thrust of the new textile policy was to pass on the benefit to the consumer. As a result of the new policy, the shift was from fibre to fabric. The real thrust should have been to shift the benefit from fibre to fabric to consumer, the person who ultimately uses. What has happened is there has been a shift from fibre to fabric no doubt but that fabric has been confined to certain sectors of the textile industry and since they are powerful people, they have been taking away all the benefits. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister as to how he can say that the new textile policy has aided the handloom weavers and how the production of cloth, which was the major objective of the policy, has resulted in giving relief to the consumer. If relief has been given, as he claims to what extent has it been there and what has been the reduction in the price of cloth?

Sir, the Minister, while participating in the debate on the new textile policy, has made a very fantastic claim that by the new policy one million additional jobs were likely to be created. In fact, there was an argument between him and me and I proved on that occasion as to how it was almost impossible for this claim unless it was going to create problems for the one who produces the things. I had given the entire statistics, working out the details. Now I do not want to go into the details. Therefore, having claimed during last year's debate that there would be the likelihood of creation of one million additional jobs, I would like him to say what is the attainment of this claim, how many additional jobs have been created out of this one million claim which was made. And this claim was shown as the reason for doing away with the protectionism which was available for the handloom sector.

Sir, the emphasis which is now being given by the way in which duty has been removed on 22 items, more

particularly on polyester fabric, has resulted in the glut of the cotton that is produced in this country. Therefore, on the one hand the new textile policy has not benefited the consumer, has not benefited the producer like the handloom weaver and on the other it has also affected the farmer who has been producing cotton in this country. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister as to how he is going to create a balance in the situation which has been created and which has led to an offsetting of the equilibrium of the entire economy. Further I would like to ask the Minister as to what steps he would suggest to meet the situation.

Then, Sir, coming to the claim in this particular document which has been presented just now, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a statement made by another Minister in the year 1984. He had stated at that time that until and unless we can move towards the modernization of the loom, it may not be possible to bring down the cost of production and unless we bring down the cost of production it will be difficult to market it and it would not be possible to compete with the other two sectors." This claim was made by a Minister who preceded the Minister who was there last year. In this connection the present Textiles Minister has stated that they have a target of modernization of 30,000 looms. This target of modernization of 30,000 looms does not form even ten per cent of the existing looms in this country, and the amount that has been allocated is only Rs. 175 lakhs. Instead of that, if he had mentioned the amount in terms of crores, perhaps it would have been better. Sir, one hundred and seventy-five lakhs of rupees have been provided to alleviate the problems of the people in this sector. And how many people are there in this sector? Ten million people. And it is for the modernization of a sector which consists of almost four million handlooms. Therefore, the intention of the Government seems to be to give only palliatives so that the disease may be controlled apparently for a while. It is not going even skin deep. It is not going deep into the problem to solve the problem. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister whether he feels that what is being done as modernisation as stated by him, is sufficient to meet the problem which was recognised by a series of Ministers who were in charge of textiles in this country and who have themselves on the floor of this House have reiterated.

Then, finally, Sir, the point which my learned friend earlier has made. We have removed certain facilities which were there by way of protectionism, and we reserved certain things only for the handloom industry which are being questioned by the powerloom sector through courts on top of it, we have also reduced the rebate period from 60 days to 30 days. If this is the case, how does he expect to have clearance of the cloth that has been produced even to the limited extent. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister whether he is thinking in terms of revising the policy of the reduction of the rebate from 60 days to 30 days and restore it to the *status quo ante* at least, if he is not prepared to give a larger period for rebate. I hope the Minister will really consider the problems of the large number of people who are engaged in the handloom industry which is almost second to agriculture in this country and try to do something for betterment of them.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chitta Basu absent. Mr. Sukomal Sen:

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Sir, in this House when the new textile policy was discussed, at that time itself we said that the

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

new textile policy was going to spell disaster for the entire textile industry of our country. The experience of these few months has proved that we were correct.

Sir, already in the mill sector the industry is shivering under a crisis. Even the NTC mills are in doldrums. Many mills have been closed down. I am not discussing all these things. As regards the powerloom industry, almost the entire industry is going to be ruined. The impact of this crisis has been seriously felt in the handloom sector also.

Sir, so far as I understand, about 90 lakhs of persons are directly engaged in handloom-weaving. May be more, I am not sure. And lakhs of peasants are engaged in cotton-growing. On the one side this new textile policy and on the other side absence of any policy in regard to raw of cotton have created a terrible mess in our country. During the year 1985-86 the production of cotton has far exceeded the Seventh Plan target of 75 lakh bales. So, on the one side cotton growers are increasing the production, and on the other side the demand for cotton in the mills, the powerloom sector as well as in the handloom sector is not increasing to the extent the growers are producing cotton in the fields. So, a crisis has developed in the country, and the Government is unable to solve it.

Sir, I am not discussing the mill sector and the powerloom sector. I am confining myself in the short time to the handloom sector. The Government has come up with a number of measures for the development of the handlom sector, as they claim it. Even in regard to those suggested measures, many questions have arisen. They say, "Modernisation of the handloom industry." What is modernisation? What does it mean. The type of handloom and the modernisation requirement also varies from region to region. It is not clear what Government means by saying that handloom should be modernised.

I will now give only one example. I am not going into all the examples. The Government has offered a managerial subsidy of Rs. 3,400 per year. I would like to ask whether it is possible to recruit an efficient and competent manager with this amount of as yearly pay? Of course, the Government has given so many suggestions, but they are not at all workable.

The Government has come up with a decision that twentytwo items will be reserved for handloom production. Previously the number of items in the reserved category was eleven. But another problem has cropped up.

In many places people have gone to the High Court challenging the Government order to reserve 22 items for the handloom sector. Now, this question is pending before the High Court, as a result of which even this decision of the Government is not workable at the moment.

So many other problems have developed in regard to the handloom sector. The Government has now said that Janata cloth will be produced by the handloom sector. What does it mean. It means the profitability of the handloom sector will be less. So, unless the Government comes out with increased amount of subsidy to the handloom sector for producing the Janata cloth, weavers cannot be encouraged.

Then, Sir, they have fixed the price of the Janata cloth as Rs. 12 per Dhoti. If we consider the buying capacity of our countrymen where fifty per cent of our people are living below the poverty line, I would like to know whether this price is a realistic one. Even this measure will not be helpful unless the price is brought within the reach of the

common man, whatever the production.

The hon. Minister has said in his statement that the production of handloom sector is increasing. Although its production has increased, stocks are accumulating. Even in the mill sector we have got an experience. Even though the strike in the Bombay mills lasted for more than one and half years, there was no effect of it on the supply side, because the cloth had already accumulated in the market. Similar situation prevails in the handloom sector also.

Sir, I will give only one figure. The Textile Committee of the Ministry of Commerce in 1978 made a study. They saw that when the average value per metre of cotton textile was Rs. 5.56, the per capita off take of cotton was 11.60 metres, while in 1980-81 when the average value per metre of it went up to Rs. 8.52, the per capita offtake fell to 9.40 metres. This study is applicable in the present situation also. So, if the prices of the produced goods go up, automatically the off-take will also be reduced. Stocks will be accumulated and ultimately the weavers will suffer. So, there will be no relief to them.

Secondly, the polyester and woollen production is also reserved for the handloom sector and the Government has given certain incentives for that. But, I may point out that that is only a marginal production of this sector. The handloom industry in our country traditionally is based upon cotton not upon polyester and woollens. All right, if the Government wants to reserve a part of it for polyester and woollen but it will be a marginal production only. But it will be
1 P.M a marginal production though the profitability will be a little more it will remain marginal because, the handloom industry cannot switch over to polyester. That is not desirable also. The Government has liberalised import policy for polyester fibre for the textile industry. In the modern world many countries are reverting to cotton, because of certain complications inherent in this polyester clothing. Our Government while liberalising the import policy for polyester fibre have also given some liberty to the handloom weavers for producing polyester goods. It is good. I agree they can produce, but it should remain only a marginal production. They should not burden the entire handloom industry.

Then, Sir, not only in the domestic marketing but also in the export marketing, the Minister has given some figures in his statement. It come to around 12 per cent of production which is exported with a great difficulty, because many countries which previously used to purchase our handloom cloths are refusing to take it. The main reasons are quality is not good and prices are also not competitive. Other countries are supplying the same type of cloth at less price. So I request the hon. Minister to come out with a policy so that more financial incentives are given to the handloom weavers. Then only the export marketing becomes favourable for the handloom weavers.

In West Bengal, the Government to a certain succeeded in this handloom policy, because IRDP programmes are working successfully. The handloom industry in West Bengal to a certain extent has developed. But that is due to other factors. The State Government is taking keen interest in it at the rural area level. That is why some improvement has taken place. But if we take into account overall policy of the Government of India, we don't find any positive approach that the handloom industry in

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

our country will develop in a better way in future.

The Minister has claimed that they are taking steps to supply yarn at controlled prices. Sir, this is a very tall claim. Actually the complaint of the handloom weavers is that with great difficulty they are procuring yarn at controlled prices. Sometimes they don't get it. These are the problems to which the Government of India should pay attention.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: While concluding, I would like to put some questions to the Minister. I hope he will answer them. Whether the Government will take adequate steps, besides what has been stated in the Minister's statement, to supply yarn to the handloom weavers at the controlled price? What action the Government of India will take in clearing the accumulated stocks? You know, Sir, that production of handloom cloth is increasing, whereas demand is not increasing on the same proportion. Whether the Government is prepared to reduce the minimum price of the Janata cloth? The poorer sections of the society are not in a position to purchase this handloom Janata cloth. Regarding rebate, some of my hon. friends, have already raised about it. If it is a fact that the rebate period has been reduced from 60 days to 30 days, then, the Government should restore the rebate period to 60 days immediately. I understand that the rebate is only 20 per cent and it has to be shared equally between the States and the Centre. I would like to know whether he is prepared to increase the amount of rebate to be shared between the Centre and States? What effective steps the Minister would take to increase the export of handloom cloth?

SHRI A. C. KULKARNI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the very outset I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the Statement which he has made in this House. It is very poorly drafted and there are some contradictions in it, particularly when this Call Attention was admitted, the basic problem was on rebate. Here, Sir, you have stated at page 4, item 3, one of the main problems facing the handloom is the supply of yarn of required counts etc. etc. Again Sir, at page 5, you say, there have also been no complaints either from the State Governments or from the State Handloom Agencies regarding the prices or availability of the yarn. Sir, these are two contrary statements. Either you admit that there is a complaint or say that there is no complaint. Then, I have got no quarrel.

Now, I basically go to the present Call Attention and ramifications of the Textile Policy. As many friends have brought out here that Textile Policy is tailor made to the requirements of Indian Cotton Mills Federation. Sir, one must understand that it is a tailor made product by the Government on the dictates of the Indian Cotton Mills Federation because Sir, except the Composite Mills Sector, no other sector have been benefited. Take the example of Handloom Sector, there are Worries. Take the example of Powerloom Sector, it is in the worst position. Cotton growers are still worst. So, this is the sum total of this new baby which has been born out of unholy alliance between the Government and the Indian Cotton Mills Federation. Sir, why do I say this? If I give some figures, perhaps, my friends, Mr. Lakshmanna, and Mr. Sukomal Sen would also like to know the growth of production in handloom. What is meant by growth of production in handloom? Sir, the

entire handloom, powerloow or any other sector depends on the cotton yarn and Sir, as per the statement, the civil deliveries of cotton yarn to the handloom sector which is in the hank form, only the handlooms can use the hank form, they cannot use the cone form. It is 383.3 million kgs and the production is 3690 million metres and that was confirmed in the statement by the Minister. Sir, as against that, the powerloom has been given in the cone and beam form 480.6 million kgs. Their production is about 466 million metres. So, this is the present position of handloom cloth and powerloom cloth, while composite mills cloth has come down because the Government policy of not permitting to instal powerlooms or the weaving apparatus except for H.O. Sir, while stating the position, my friends must also know from South, UP or Andhra Pradesh from wherever they are, the real position of the handloom and powerloom vis-a-vis the composite mills, the enemy is the composite mills. We are unnecessarily talking of certain sectors like powerloom and you are now trying to kill a rubber band taking it as a serpent. Here, Sir, number of handlooms as claimed in a previous reply, day before yesterday, the Minister said, it is an estimate that 30 lakh handlooms are there. That is quite understandable. Then, in the powerlooms, they have mentioned 7 to 8 millions. But Sir, the employment created in handloom is: direct employment, 30 lakhs and dependents 1 crore of persons. In case of powerlooms, the direct employment is 20 lakhs and the dependents are about a crore of persons and in Composite mills, Mr. Minister, please note the total employment created in the Composite Mills Sector is 1.61 lakhs as against 20 lakhs, 30 lakhs direct employment in other two sectors and the Minister has tailor made his policy to benefit the capitalist mill industry and these 1.61 lakh workers. Then I go to the next point which is very important to me. The Government, in the present statement which has been supplied to us, says on page 2:

> "Under the Handlooms (Reservation of Articles for Production) Act, 1985, on the advice of the Advisory Committee as provided in the Act, a Notification reserving 22 items... has been issued."

Actually this is a defective notification. It has been challenged in the Karnataka High Court, the Madras High Court and the Bombay High Court, and stay orders have been granted. This is the brainwave of the Chairman of the Handicrafts Corporation, Smt. Pupul Jayakar or whoever it is. In the Madras High Court, when this matter was being discussed, the judge asked the counsel appearing on behalf of the Government whether the Advisory Committee meeting was held. The Government held a meeting subsequently. Only very recently that meeting was held where they made a whitewash and confirmed that 22 items should be reserved. I am mentioning this point because, with the reservation of these 22 items, apart from the financial constraints which the Finance Minister has put in the 1985 budget, the powerloom industry has come to a chaos. The handloom sector must know that the powerloom sector does not wish and will never wish that the handloom sector should be extinguished because powerloom is an intermediate technology as far as the handloom is concerned and this intermediate technology gives employment in the rural areas. So the Minister must know, while issuing any order whatsoever, what is the staggering employment figure in the handloom and the powerloom sectors. That is why I desire that the Minister will be well advised on this.

Now, in these 22 items, dhotis and saries have been included. (*Time bell rings*) Sir, I will require another five minutes.. The Minister will please take down my figures or the officers concerned will take down my figures. A seminar was held in Ahmedabad on 7-2-1985 by the Ahmedabad Textile Research Association, the Bombay Textile Research Association and the

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

South India Textile Research Association. And what are the consumption figures for dhotis and saris which you have reserved for the handloom sector? The dhoti requirement of the entire country is 1,250 million metres, and for saris the requirement is 2,950 million metres. If you add them, the total comes to 4,200 million metres. Now this seminar has estimated the production in the handloom sector at 2,994 million metres. But I do hope that the production is 3,690 million metres. Apart from this, you have allowed the handloom sector to produce the janata cloth. And as per the reply given by the Minister two days back the provisional figure for the janata cloth is 398 million sq. metres. If we add all these together, what is the production of the handloom sector? The total production is 3,690 million metres. And you say that 4,200 million metres of dhotis and saris will be taken out from the powerlooms and handed over to the handlooms. The janata cloth has been handed over. I think the day is not too far off when the people will have to go naked, if the saris and dhotis are not made available to them. The handloom sector should produce dhotis and saris. I have got no objection to it. But you have taken it out from the powerloom sector. What can you call it—it is a rape on the powerloom sector which is providing employment in the rural areas for 20 lakh workers and nourishing one crore of persons. These are my points. I am now coming to the rebate point and the other thing which has been brought in today. This rebate period of 15 days or 30 days is totally unrealistic. unpragmatic. As Mr. Aruna has pointed out, the process itself requires a longer period in bringing cloth to the market'. I can give you the example of Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh and of Bihar. Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are such provinces where there is every type of corruption, manoeuvring and mismanagement. But look at the Handloom Cooperative Society in Madras; it is a very nice example; Andhra is a nice example. But Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are such...

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Is there nobody sitting from U.P.?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: But why? You are from UP; you have been elected from UP and you should know better. It is a had fact that in Kanpur there is embezzlement of handloom rebate. Why are you looking for other Members? You are yourself elected from UP...

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: I have seen it in the case of sugar in Maharashtra.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sugar is in your body. In regard to rebate one has to be very careful. I would request you, Mr. Khurshid Alam Khan, please take out the burden of Pupul Jayakar on the handlooms and powerlooms, for heaven's sake...

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Sir, persons who are not here in the House, their names should not be taken...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I plead with the honourable Minister, he cannot stand like this; he can stand only on a point of order. Finally, my humble suggestion for the Government is let the Minister take a survey of the requirements of sarees and dhotis and sent a report to Maharashtra. Karnataka and Tmil Nadu, because Tamil Nadu Powerlooms Association has obtained a stay order, Karnataka Powerlooms Association has obtained a stay order. You send your representative there; we will sit with them, try to examine the whole thing. Don't go by the figures or the advice given by your officers. It is we who will give you a better advice. I believe the Minister will look into these grievances and to the needful.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : उपसभापति जी, सरकार की ओर से जो बयान अभी हम लोगों के सामने आया है, वह लगता है कि तथ्यों से बिलकुल भिन्न है, कम से कम पहली ही लाईन जो है, वह प्रथम ग्रासे हि माक्षिका पातः वाली बात हो गई कि कोई भी स्पेशल समस्या--

"No special problems in the handloom sector have been reported since the declaration of the new Textile Policy."

यह अत्यन्त ही खतरनाक बात है कि सरकार इन चीजों को समझ नहीं पाती है। सरकार ने नई टैक्सटाईल पालिसी में हैंडलूम के लिए जिन सुविधाओं की व्यवस्था की थी, वह कोई भी उनके पास नहीं पहुंच पाई है।

पहली बात है रेजरवेशन की— वह तो कोर्ट का स्टे आर्डर बनकर रह गया है। वह तो त्रिशंकु बना हुआ है। वह उनके पास पहुंचा ही नहीं है। तो उनको फायदा क्या हुआ उनको लेकर।

जहां तक इसका सवाल है कि बुनकरों की कुछ तनख्वाह बढ़ी होगी, तो उस संबंध में हम आपसे बता दें, वह इकनामिक टाइम्स का 17 जून का जो एडिटोरियल है टैक्सटाईल पालिसी के संबंध में-- मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान उस ओर आकृष्ट करता हूं। मैं उद्धरण देता हूं--

"According to the All India Handloom Fabrics Marketing Cooperative Society, the handloom weaver's wage for a pair of sarees or dhotis works out to a ridiculous low of Rs. 8 per day under the Controlled Cheap Cloth Scheme."

यानी आठ रूपये तो इसमें प्रोवीजन ही किया गया है और उनको आठ रुपये भी नहीं मिल पाते हैं।

दूसरी बात जो मंत्री महोदय ने कही है कि हैंडलूम का उत्पादन बढ़ा है, यह भी गलत है। हैंडलूम का उत्पादन नहीं बढा है। सरकार जानती है कि हैण्डलम सेक्टर के लिये सूता दिया जाता है, उस आधार पर उत्पादन को बर्क आउट कर लिया जाता है और उसी से कह दिया है कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ा है। उसी सम्पादकीय में कहा गया है--

"Official estimates of the growth of handloom cloth output including cheap cloth appears to be an overestimate."

इसलिये यह बात भी नहीं है कि उनका उत्पादन बढा है। यह भी संशय की बात है। इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि इस प्रश्न का वे जवाब दें कि किस ढंग से हैंडलूम के उत्पादन का आँकलन होता है, कैसे हम उसका हिसाब लगाते हैं? सरकार ने यह अपेक्षा की थी कि अगर हम टैक्सों में छूट देंगे तो कपड़े की कीमत आम लोगों की पहुंच के लायक होगी यानी सस्ता होगा। लेकिन इसके पहले, एक बयान में मंत्री महोदय ने ही कहा है, यानी पहले उन्होंने जो असेसमेंट किया है, जो गवर्नमेंट का है, उसे सम्पादकीय से मैं उद्धृत करता हूं--

"After the duty reliefs, the prices of polyester staple fibre and blended yarn showed declining trends. But almost the entire duty relief was passed on by the fibre-manufacturing industry to the user industry."

यानी मजदूरों को, आम लोगों को, कंजूमर्स को कुछ भी नहीं मिल पाया। टैक्स भी घटा दिया और आम लोगों को फायदा भी नहीं मिला। अगर सरकार कहती है कि आम लोगों को यह सुविधा दी गयी थी, तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि कंक्रीट रूप में बता दें कि आपने यह टैक्स रिलीफ दी, तो उसका कहां पर असर हुआ, क्या कपड़े की कीमतें घटीं? आम लोगों के लिए न तो मजदूरी बढ़ी और न कपड़े की कीमतों में कमी हुई और उधर क्या हुआ, रूई के दाम घट गये। इससे बहुतायत हो गया और वहां ग्लट हो गया मार्केट में। तो यह जो स्थिति है, इसका सारा फायदा बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपतियों को मिला। इससे उद्योग और जनता के लिये कोई फायदा नहीं मिल पाया।

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

इसलिये मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करूंगा कि स्टे आर्डर के सम्बन्ध में क्या स्थिति है, उसके बारे में सरकार स्पष्ट ढंग से बताये कि कैसे हम इस समस्या से मुकाबला करने के लिये जा रहे हैं और क्या इसको नाइन्थ शेड्यूल में सरकार रखने जा रही है ? क्योंकि यह काम सबसे समाज के गरीब वर्ग के लिये होगा ?

इसी सिलसिले में मैं मन्त्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि जो बेनिफिट आप सोसायटी के माध्यम से देना चाहते हैं, वह भी गरीबों को नहीं मिल पाता है, हैंडलूम वर्कर को नहीं मिल पाता है । इसका कारण यह है कि बहुत ज्यादा भ्रष्टाचार इन सोसायटीज के जरिये होता है । अभी हाल ही में अखबार में आया था, हमारे बिहार के मधुबनी जिले में एक पार्लियामेंट के माननीय सदस्य हैं, उनके ऊपर डी० एम० ने पांच लाख का सोसायटी के गबन का केस कर दिया । माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि उनसे बिना पूछे हुये ऐसा किया है । जो भी हो किन्तु इस तरह के पचलखा गबन करने वाले आपके यहां बहुत लोग हैं । क्या उसकी आप जाँच करायेंगे कि इसकी सचमुच में क्या स्थिति है, जिससे आम लोगों को, कम से कम वीवर्स को हम रिलीफ दे सकें । कई सदस्यों ने कहा है कि जो 60 दिन का रिबेट पीरिएड था, उसमें जो कटौती की गई है, उसको रोका जाये, फिर से उसे 60 दिन कर दिया जाये, मैं भी इस पक्ष में हूं ।

दूसरी बात, मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा, एकुमुलेटेड स्टाक जो हैंडलूम क्लाथ का है, वह गवर्नमेंट के साथ सेवरल करोड़ का है और इस कारण यह उद्योग ठप्प कर दी जाएगी पूरी इंडस्ट्री, सोसायटी और इसलिये इसके बारे में सरकार अविलंब कुछ करे । जो सरकार की क्लाथ की रिक्वायरमेंट है, इसका कम से कम 50 परसेंट सरकार यह करे कि इन्हें हैंडलूम सेक्टर से ले ।

दूसरा मेरा सुझाव होगा—

"Operation of a revolving fund for continuous cash flow for reimbursement of rebate claims and capital investment by the industry."

रिबेट क्लेम वर्षों-वर्षों चलते रहते हैं । इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा इसके बारे में आप कुछ कहें । सरकार ने जो यह फिगर दिया है हैंडलूम के एक्सपोर्ट के बारे में, उसके बारे में भी यह बातें आई हैं अखबारों में कि पावरलूम का एक हिस्सा ले कर उसको दिखला दिया जाता है उस फिगर का । इसलिये उसके बारे में हम मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहेंगे कि उसकी क्या स्थिति है, सही ढंग से बतायें कि कैसे यह किया जा रहा है ?

अन्तिम बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जो सूता दिया जाता है उसका बहुत ज्यादा दाम है और स्टेटमेंट में भी कहा गया है कि यही सबसे बड़ी समस्या है । मैं सरकार के साथ इसके विचार में एकरूपता रखता हूं । मैं उससे सहमत हूं । लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूं कि इसकी व्यवस्था क्या की जा रही है ? क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बतायेंगे कि हम किस ढंग से उनको सस्ता सूता दे सकेंगे ? अगर पब्लिक सैक्टर देगा तो इसकी क्या व्यवस्था की जायेगी ? हम चाहेंगे कि कैसे उनको सस्ता सूता मिले इसकी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये । सरकार बतलाये कि वह इसके लिये क्या करने जा रही है ?

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं । वीवर्ज लोग बहुत ही संकटपूर्ण जीवन बिता रहे है । आप जो भी सुविधायें देते हैं वह बीच में ही लोग रख लेते हैं, गंगा की तरह वह शिव जी की जटा में ही रह जाती है । भ्रष्ट लोगों के पास ही सुविधायें रह जाती हैं, और लोगों के पास पहुंच नहीं पाती हैं । अगर आप हैंडलूम उद्योग को सचमुच कंपीट करवाना चाहते हैं तो स्टेटमेंट में जो आपने बताया है उसके अनुसार बहुत कम साधन दिये गये हैं । इतने कम साधनों से यह अनुसंधान का काम नहीं हो सकता है । इसलिये हैंडलूम उद्योग की तकनीक को उन्नत करने के लिये सरकार को इस पर ज्यादा जोर देना चाहिये । अभी जो वेज मिल रही है उससे तो न वह जिंदा रह सकता है और न वह मर सकता है । वे मरेंगे इसलिये

नहीं कि खाने को कुछ मिल जाता है, जिंदा इसलिये नहीं रहेंगे कि पूरी वेज नहीं मिलती है । इसलिये मैं चाहता हूं कि सरकार इन समस्याओं पर विचार करे । धन्यवाद ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gopalsamy. Only four minutes.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): I will take only four minutes.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Government of India has turned a deaf ear to the cry of the 15 million handloom weavers because of the new textile policy which has fallen like a bolt from the blue on these 15 million handloom weavers. So, handlooms have become Achilles' Heel of your, so proclaimed new textile policy.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister, for what reasons you reduced the rebate days of 60 days to 30? For what reasons? Already you have failed to provide yarn for these handloom weavers; they have been deprived of their livelihood. You have inflicted wounds. Now you have put more salt in the wounds; you have reduced the rebate days. and you have put more burden on the State Governments, this is, reducing another 25 per cent of the share of the rebate, which is nothing but injustice to the handloom weavers. And when you extend Rs. 500 crores to the National Textile Corporation, why are you not willing to give even Rs. 50 crores as subsidy to handlooms? Your entire package proposals have collapsed. And you have been telling that you have no objection to purchase 50 per cent of the requirements of the Central Government. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, have you taken any steps to purchase even 5 per cent of the requirements of the Central Government? I want a categorical reply from the Minister. What steps have been taken to protect the interests of the handloom weavers? You have not taken steps to supply yarn; you have reduced the rebate days...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only one minute more.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You have not taken any steps to provide the market for the Central Government Departments to purchase. Therefore your textile policy has totally destroyed the welfare of the hondloom weavers. Those who are employed in powerlooms also are not happy with the Government. The capitalists and the mill-owners are happy to a certain extent with your Government. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what he is going to do to help these starving millions of handloom weavers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-one minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at thirty-two minutes past two of the clock. **The Vice-Chairman (Shri G. Swaminathan) in the Chair.**

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Oil Discovery in Kaikalur in Krishna-Godavari Basin

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): I welcome the new Vice-Chairman.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Welcome from all sides.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Thak you. Now, the hon. Minister to make a statement.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY AND MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): Sir, before I